

THIRTY FIVE CENTS

DECEMBER 1957

# MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

## THE SOVIET VIEW OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

D. FEDOTOV

## AN AMERICAN ANALYST REPLIES

NORMAN REIDER

VOL. 9

8

*The Meaning of Little Rock*

THE EDITORS

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEETZ

## CONTENTS

VOLUME NINE NUMBER EIGHT DECEMBER 1957

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Meaning of Little Rock .....	241
THE SOVIET VIEW OF PSYCHOANALYSIS by D. Fedotov .....	249
A PSYCHOANALYST REPLIES by Norman Reider .....	254
STRACHEY AND CAPITALISM by Shigeto Tsuru .....	259
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing .....	265

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1957, by Monthly Review, Inc.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York.

Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.

MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York.

Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—\$4; two years—\$7.

By 1st class mail—United States \$6; everywhere else \$7.

By air mail—No. America \$8; So. America \$13; Europe \$17; Asia \$24.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

## NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

The big news at the MR office is that we have completed arrangements for the publication, in the Spring, of a book by Anne Braden, wife of the central figure in the famous "Braden case." Both of the editors and all of the staff read the manuscript and all were unanimous in their opinion that this will be, in many ways, the most important book in the history of MR Press. It is much more than the absorbing story of the Braden case; it is one of the most moving and revealing documents on the problem of race relations in the American South. More details as we get nearer publication date.

You will see, on the back cover, an announcement of three other MR Press books which will be ready in January. We always try to give our readers plenty of advance notice of books to come so they can take advantage of our generous prepublication offers. Why not save money by ordering now?

And while we are on the subject of saving money, we call your attention to the Christmas Gift offer on page 271. Long-time readers will recognize that our gift of *The Great Road* by Agnes Smedley for every new sub you send us, is the handsomest offer we have made since the founding of MR. We hope you will help yourself—and us—by acting at once.

(continued on inside back cover)

## THE MEANING OF LITTLE ROCK

There is probably no politician in the United States who has a more highly developed propensity to compromise than President Eisenhower. The principles he believes in are all much too vague and general to define a specific course of action, and he seems to be temperamentally opposed to taking a strong stand on anything. It was thus in a spirit of unlimited compromise that he approached the school integration problem. In response to a question at a press conference on July 17th, he said: "I can't imagine any set of circumstances that would ever induce me to send Federal troops . . . into any area to enforce the orders of a Federal court, because I believe the common sense of America will never require it." When, less than two months later, Governor Faubus, taking Eisenhower at his word, began for the first time to put into practice the infamous doctrine of interposition, the President shilly-shallied, begged the Governor not to do it, received him as an official guest, and issued statements conveying a totally misleading picture of the real situation—all presumably in the hope that he could somehow muddle through without ever facing the issue squarely.

And yet when the showdown finally came, Eisenhower acted quickly and decisively. Federal troops, complete with bayonets, were sent into Little Rock where they have since remained giving living, tangible protection to the long-proclaimed rights of Negroes to equality before the law. Never have soldiers had a more honorable task; never has a President acted with greater legal and moral justification. But why this sudden change in the President's behavior? Why didn't he continue the search for a way out—which from the Negro point of view could only be a sellout?

In terms of the immediate situation the answer, of course, is that Governor Faubus gave him no choice. Faubus is apparently not only a narrow-minded bigot but also a very stupid man. Whatever his motives—and it makes little difference whether they were personal or political—he deliberately backed Eisenhower into a corner from which the only escape was an honorable one. If Eisenhower had refused to act, every state in the South would have "interposed": the South would have reversed the verdict of the Civil War without so much as firing a shot. Faubus, in short, violated the first rule of war and politics which says at all costs to avoid a showdown with a stronger opponent. In so doing, he made a man of Eisenhower, at

## MONTHLY REVIEW

least for a brief moment, and opened up for the Republican Party a political oilfield of vast but as yet unmeasured dimensions.

The reasons for this are well known but too little appreciated. The central fact of the American Negro's life, North as well as South, is humiliating inferiority forced upon him by superior white power and the ever-present threat and frequent use of violence. Whites can never fully comprehend what it means to be in this position, but if they want to understand what is now happening they had better make the best use of their imagination they can. To a Negro there can be no more satisfying or reassuring picture than that of United States soldiers accompanying Negro children to school in a Southern city. Here, for the first time in the lives of most Negroes living today, is concrete, irrefutable evidence that the law is on their side and that it can protect as well as oppress them. Ironically enough, Eisenhower and the Republican Party wanted nothing so much as not to have to provide the Negroes with that evidence. But the deed is done, and if the Republicans are prepared to maintain the advantage thus unwillingly gained, then Little Rock could be made to have a profound effect on every thinking Negro citizen in the country.

By contrast, the Democratic Party is hopelessly compromised by the events of Little Rock. There is nothing new or surprising, of course, in the stand of Faubus and his fellow Southern "extremists." But what Little Rock has done as nothing else could have is to show up the "moderates" in both the Southern and Northern wings of the Party. The Southerners have in *practice* aligned themselves on the side of segregation and an indefinite continuance of the status quo. The Northerners have shown themselves to be unprincipled cowards, afraid to split the Party lest they be cast out into the political wilderness. To be sure, there are a handful of Democratic exceptions, but they are a minor element in the Party as a whole and helpless to mold its actual policies (as distinct from its campaign promises). After the spectacle of the last three months, it would seem that no Negro could possibly trust *any* Democrat in power. Federal troops are all that stand between the Negro and the fury of the Southern mob, now aroused as never before. Who, Negro or white, could feel hopeful, let alone confident, that a Democratic President would not quickly find a formula to withdraw the troops as the only possible way of preserving Party harmony and the spoils of office? It would not be the formula of a Faubus, of course, but it would be on that account more, not less, deadly to Negro aspirations.

Why, then, was this reasoning not reflected in the local and state elections in New York and New Jersey, where the Negro vote went to Wagner and Meyner, not to their Republican opponents?

There are, we think, several explanations. Most important was the awareness on the part of Northern Negroes that Eisenhower was backed into a corner at Little Rock and did what he did out of necessity, not out of principle. When and if the Republicans commit themselves *willingly* to the principle of enforcement of judicial orders against segregation, when and if they become increasingly sensitive to Negro demands, then perhaps the memory of the marked gains under Roosevelt and the New Deal will fade. It is clear, too, that the elections came at precisely the wrong time for the Republicans: the rising cost of living; the growing fear about the end of the boom and the possible onset of a depression; the dramatic advent of sputnik which increased the number of those who were becoming more and more critical of Ike's lack of leadership—all these undoubtedly had their effect.

However, in spite of the Democratic success in the off-year election, there is every reason to suppose that Little Rock—*given Republican Party willingness to exploit it to the utmost*—could throw the Negro vote, nationally, to the Republicans. There is at least a good chance that the Negro vote could be the decisive factor in enough Northern cities to assure continued Republican dominance of the national administration for the visible future. If this in fact would happen, failure would add to the strains on an already divided Democratic Party. Long a bundle of contradictions held together only by lack of principle and love of office, the Democratic Party as we have known it for far too long would then at last be on the way out.

It might seem that the Republicans ought to be so delighted by this prospect that they would enthusiastically espouse the twin causes of Negro emancipation and Democratic ruin. And some of their more ambitious younger men, led by Vice President Nixon, have indeed been following this course. They quite logically see in it the road to domination of the Party and a long tenure of national office. Yet it is clear that the Party as a whole is embarrassed by its increasing reliance on Negro support and seemingly has no desire to knock the Democrats out of the political ring. How explain this apparent paradox?

Every ruling class has what the political philosophers call its *arcana dominationis*, its secret of power, and it is here that we approach that of the American ruling class. The regulation of American political life—suppression of the most important issues and management of the secondary ones—has been achieved by an unwritten alliance between conservative Northern Republicans and equally conservative Southern Democrats. With the somewhat doubtful exception of a few years in the first two Roosevelt administrations, this alliance has worked smoothly and efficiently. Ultimately, as

FDR himself clearly recognized by his attempted purge of the South in 1938, it undermined the New Deal and has since easily nipped in the bud every incipient threat of a new liberal-left resurgence.

Now it is important to understand that the linchpin of this arrangement is the Southern oligarchy's monopoly of political power in its own region. And this in turn has depended on the disfranchisement of Southern Negroes and the division of the Southern working class into warring black and white factions. From which it follows that for Republicans to fight for Negro rights in the South is to seek short-run partisan advantage at the risk of possibly very serious long-run damage to their class interests.\* There are ambitious politicians willing to do it, and the Party may well come under their control. But the great absentee owners of America, ever the real backbone of the Republican Party, can never back such a course with consistency and enthusiasm. Like Ike, who is their authentic political representative, they would prefer to live a life of perpetual compromise; like him, they will act decisively only when there is literally no alternative.

It might appear to follow from this analysis that the "new" political situation is not so new after all—or at least that what is new about it will soon pass. The Republicans, so the argument might run, though forced to slap down a Faubus, will find a way to compromise with the more politically sophisticated Southern Democrats, the "moderates" who are willing to concede a token amount of integration in order to satisfy the law, while preserving the substance of the Southern socio-political order. In this view, Little Rock is merely a tempest in a teapot and everything can soon be expected to return to normal.

This is no doubt a Republican, as much as a Democratic, dream. But it is a pipe dream all the same. The forces that produced Little Rock are still at work, obscurely in the background but none the less inexorably and with growing power. What is new in the present political situation is only a beginning; there is much more to come, and it will again force the hand of Republicans and Democrats alike, not once but many times.

These forces can be grouped under three headings:

(1) The economic development of the South under the aegis of Big Business. The traditional pattern of Southern race relations has served the purpose of providing a class of helots to wait on the

\* To avoid misunderstanding: We do *not* argue that political reform in the South will be quickly followed by the organization of a new liberal, let alone radical, political party. What we do argue is that in the absence of reform in the South, the American ruling class has an iron-clad guarantee against any such potentially dangerous development.

upper-crust whites and to do the community's dirty work. To preserve this pattern and all the comforts and privileges it brought them, the Southern oligarchy deliberately excluded Negroes from most industrial jobs and consigned them to such employments as cotton cultivation, domestic and personal services, ditch digging, and the like. Industrialization, which has been taking place at a very rapid pace since the beginning of World War II, has necessarily changed this situation in many important respects. Corporate capital is interested in profits, not in the availability of a servant class. It needs wage labor and it tends to hire by skills and pay scales, not by skin color. It is not that old forms of discrimination are destroyed overnight: they are not, of course. But they are subjected to strains; new patterns of labor relations are established; divisions among the ruling whites are created; Negroes are given fresh ideas and new hope. Industrialization, in a word, shakes a society to its foundations and sets all of its parts in motion. This process is now in full swing in the South, and it alone renders illusory any hopes of restoring and stabilizing the status quo ante.

(2) The new determination of Negroes to achieve first-class citizenship. This is partly due to the effects of industrialization but also has other equally deep roots: the experience of Negro youths in the armed forces and in foreign countries during World War II and the Korean War, and, perhaps equally important, the worldwide awakening of the colonial peoples. This is a force which literally nothing can stop; it insures that any compromise situation short of full equality of the races is necessarily temporary and unacceptable to Negroes. More than that, it is a force which by its very nature is cumulative: every success adds to the self-confidence of Negroes and to their faith in the ultimate victory of their cause.

(3) The increasingly urgent need of the American ruling class for friends and allies in a predominantly colored world. This, we may be sure, was one of the reasons which weighed most heavily with the Supreme Court in its crucial desegregation decision. It must have been uppermost in Eisenhower's mind as he struggled with the Little Rock crisis. If anything is certain in this world, it is that the international situation will become more, not less, important in shaping Washington's future attitudes and policies toward segregation and all other racial issues.

These, then, are the driving forces which underlie and dominate recent developments. By now, they have become meshed into a sort of dynamic pattern which is discernible in the Little Rock crisis and can be expected to be repeated again and again. Negroes press forward. They are blocked by state governments. A crisis develops. The administration in Washington is forced to step in and take the side

## MONTHLY REVIEW

of the Negroes. Limited gains are won. And then the process begins all over again.

The motor of this process is evidently the Negro himself, and the pace of developments depends largely on his energy and persistence, his ability to throw up an appropriate leadership, his skill in attracting a growing proportion of the white community to his cause. But whatever the pace may be, it is clear that both the direction of developments and the final goal are now determined beyond any possibility of change.

Faced with this prospect, what attitude and policies should the American Left adopt? This is a question which should receive much more thought and discussion than it has up to now. We offer the following suggestions in the hope that they will prove both constructive and stimulating:

(1) There should be no illusions about the Left's playing a leading role in the foreseeable future. Leadership belongs to the Negro community, and it is unlikely for some time to come to have any strong *conscious* leftward tendencies. (One of the reasons for the total fiasco of the American Communist Party's Negro policy in the past has always been its pretension to leadership of the Negro liberation movement—a pretension which can be qualified with approximately equal justification as arrogant, ridiculous, and baseless.)

(2) The Left's most important task, now and probably for a long time to come, is educational—to raise the level of consciousness and understanding of Negroes and whites alike. But of course educational work does not exclude other activities. Quite the contrary: only those who work hard, if necessary at the smallest and dirtiest jobs, can expect to be trusted and believed. It follows that adherents of the Left should be the best and most loyal workers in such organizations as the NAACP and the Southern Conference Educational Fund, not with a view to taking them over or making their policies but for the purpose of helping them achieve the aims they have set themselves.

(3) To do the educational job effectively requires a clear view of short- and long-run goals and an understanding of American politics—both, unfortunately, qualities in which the American Left has been sadly deficient in the past. The long-run goals are, of course, equality for colored and white, and, beyond that, socialism. It may be that these goals can be achieved only together, but this is not certain and there is neither need nor possibility to decide the question now. In the meantime, what is certain is that the goals are wholly compatible and can be fought for separately or in any combination that actual conditions dictate. There are specific situations



in which it would be irrelevant or harmful to bring up the question of socialism, others in which it would be stupid not to.

(4) The hardest job of all is to know how, and teach others, to act in a principled way within the present American political framework. It is necessary to play politics but to avoid becoming the plaything of politics, to use the existing machinery but not be used by it. Under existing circumstances, for example, Negroes are 100 percent right to prefer a Republican in the White House to a Democrat; they would be just as wrong to commit themselves to the Republican Party. Every political choice, in other words, has to be made on its own merits without any regard for the ulterior consequences for the Republican and Democratic Parties. Independent political *organization* (except possibly in isolated localities) is at present impossible; independent political *behavior* is both possible and essential.

We shall be told by our liberal friends that this is a recipe for helping the Republican Party and hurting the Democratic Party. The reply can only be a resolute: So what? If the Democrats had a decent foreign policy—one that would promote coexistence and peace—there would be a real dilemma. But of course the Democrats don't; if anything they are more war-minded than the Big Business core of the Republican Party. For the rest, while we of the Left have no interest in helping the Republicans, whatever damage can be inflicted on either of the parties is all to the good. Real progress will come in this country only when *both* of them have been discredited and defeated, and this should never be forgotten even for a moment.

(5) It is very important to clarify for ourselves and others a problem which is going to loom increasingly large as time goes by, the problem of racial relations in the North. Southern segregationists never tire of telling Northerners to clean their own house before trying to reform others, and there is no denying that the argument is an effective one. Analysis, however, shows that it is as wrong as it is insincere.

The point is not, of course, that there is no racial problem in the North. It exists and it is growing more acute daily.\* But no solution is possible except in conjunction with profound social reforms which are obviously still a long way in the future. The same problem exists in the South and it will ultimately require the same solution. But in the meantime there are *special* problems in the South which do not exist in the North (or exist only to a relatively small extent),

---

\* See "Metropolitan Segregation," by Morton Grodzins, *Scientific American*, October 1957. This is a first-rate piece of work which should receive the widest possible circulation.

## MONTHLY REVIEW

and these are problems which must be solved *before* there can be any hope of successfully tackling basic issues of social reform. The Southern Negro must attain legal equality, above all the right to vote, as the only possible means of breaking the political monopoly of the Southern oligarchy and with it the ruling-class stranglehold on American political life.

(6) *Above all the right to vote.* This is the crux of the matter now, and it is up to us of the Left to throw all our energies into realizing it. When the Southern Negro has the right to vote, the American political scene will really change and the stage will be set for the next step forward, which can only be the organization of a genuine labor party embracing both black and white, both North and South.

(November 10, 1957)

---

*If he knows enough to be hanged, he knows enough to vote.*

—Frederick Douglass

---

*The time is past when Christians in America can take a long spoon and hand the gospel to the black man out the back door.*

—Mordecai W. Johnson

---

*The Negroes are a suffering people, and we as a civil society are they by whom they have suffered.*

—John Woolman

---

*An American is one who will fight for his freedom and that of his neighbor.*

—H. L. Ickes

---

*The Democratic Party ain't on speaking terms with itself.*

—Mr. Dooley

## THE SOVIET VIEW OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

BY D. FEDOTOV

In the Soviet Union we greatly honor everything of genuine worth in our own national as well as in world science. We cherish the germs of human reason that have come down to us from past millennia, such as the writings of Hippocrates and the *Canon* of medical science by Abou-Ali-Ibn-Sina (Avicenna); we revere the heroic labors of Edward Jenner and the immortal work of Elie Mechnikov; we admire the scientific realism of Claude Bernard and the immense intellectual sweep of Ivan Sechenov. Contrary to the calumnies of our ill-wishers, in no other land is there such profound respect for Charles Darwin and Paul Ehrlich, for Luther Burbank and Louis Pasteur as in ours. We appreciate the scientific contribution of Edward Fleming and the strict objectivity of the outstanding researches of Walter Cannon. And when we speak of the great Ivan Pavlov, the creator of the materialist conception of the higher nervous activity, we at the same time bear in mind that this conception could not have been formulated without the previous labors of Sechenov as well as the great legacy of Darwin's creative genius.

We value highly the works of the advanced scholars of today. But while paying due respect to everything which is truly scientific and serves man's progress, we cannot indifferently let pass theories that are anti-scientific and that drag human reason backward. One such theory, widely held in several countries, is that of psychoanalysis, the creation of the Austrian neuro-pathologist Sigmund Freud.

I have received a kind invitation from the editors of this journal to express myself on the subject indicated in the title. I am glad to do so.

First, it should be pointed out that while in the 1920s, and earlier, a number of physicians in the Soviet Union did evince some interest in psychoanalysis, at the present time Soviet physicians, psychologists, and physiologists read psychoanalytic works only for the purpose of keeping in touch with the scientific interests of our colleagues abroad.

To meet this purpose of the Soviet scholars, our libraries sub-

---

*Dr. Fedotov is Director of the Institute of Psychiatry of the Ministry of Health of the USSR.*

## MONTHLY REVIEW

scribe to books and journals on psychoanalysis, along with other publications issued abroad. Also, a number of psychoanalytic works, particularly the major works of Freud, are available in Russian translation and are thus accessible to our readers.

But neither the theoretical works of the psychoanalysts nor their practical activities satisfy Soviet scholars and physicians. Indeed, both are rejected as lacking in scientific substance.

The reasons why this attitude toward psychoanalysis has become established in the Soviet Union cannot be grasped without taking into account the tremendous significance that Pavlov's teachings and the materialistic view in general have assumed in Soviet science.

Freud and his followers have been unable to find a method for the objective exploration of the physiology of the brain. At the same time, Pavlov's teaching has provided science with a tremendously significant method for such exploration. At the present time, both here and abroad, including the United States, a great deal is being done toward the mastery and development of Pavlov's teachings, and methods are being worked out for the objective exploration of the brain's functioning. The methods of conditioned reflexes and electro-encephalography, particularly, are assuming ever greater importance. In this way, the progress of true science is providing students with a means for the objective investigation of psychic processes.

Yet the psychoanalysts persist in ignoring the achievements of science and continue to treat psychic processes as something utterly independent of the physiological processes in the brain, the basis of psychic activity. In his *Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Freud wrote that in its investigations psychoanalysis must cast aside all anatomical, chemical, and physiological theories as irrelevant and must operate only with psychological concepts that are specifically psychoanalytic. This position of Freud's continues to characterize, in essence, psychoanalytic work to the present time.

Our materialist view renders such a dichotomy between the psyche and its material base quite unacceptable. In this ignoring by psychoanalysis of the scientific discoveries in the physiology of the brain we discern a reactionary tendency to drag science backward.

This position of psychoanalysis, the position of separating the psyche from the brain, has, quite naturally, a negative effect in practice. We will permit ourselves only one example.

The psychoanalysts have often turned their attention to ulcerous affections. A number of American authors, starting from psychoanalytic positions, have attempted to solve the problem by considering exclusively psychic factors. Thus, one of the leaders of Ameri-

## SOVIET VIEW OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

can psychoanalysis, F. Alexander, asserted in an article which appeared a few years ago that at the basis of the etiology of ulcerous ailments lies a particularly intense and, by its very nature ungratified, "oral-aggressive" urge to satiation, an urge that has been driven into the unconscious. Hence the pathogenesis of ulcers is reduced to a fantastic psychological mechanism. Let us see how the same ailment is viewed by the proponents of Pavlovian views.

Academician K. M. Bykov (Leningrad) and his collaborator I. T. Kurtsin, after thorough research, established that the etiology of ulcers is compounded of many factors: type of higher nervous activity, presence of characteristic "ulcerous diathesis," regimen of eating, living conditions, disturbance in the functioning of the vegetative nervous system, and various changes in the biochemistry of the organism. Such a broad understanding of the etiology of ulcers naturally determines the system of treatment. We are convinced that the one-sided view of the psychoanalysts in this matter reflects negatively on their handling of patients, and prevents the timely application of necessary and truly useful methods of treatment.

Similar differences in the understanding and treatment of sicknesses may be cited without end.

We are definitely at variance with the psychoanalytic trends in the understanding of the nature of the psyche. We start from the premise that the psyche is a reflection in the brain of objectively existent reality. Human consciousness reflects human existence and this insures the oneness of man and his environment. This is not the view held by Freud or by any of the later psychoanalytic schools. In psychoanalytic theory, the role of the external world in forming the psyche is extremely limited. The psychoanalytic schools cling to the notion that the unconscious is a separate subdivision of the psyche, essentially independent of the external world, the environment, and one that exerts a decisive influence on man's consciousness. Man is thus fenced off from the world, from the reality of which he is a part and outside of which, indeed without his oneness with which, he is inconceivable. Thus psychoanalysis ignores the role of the external environment in man's psyche, it denies man's social essence. This psychoanalytic conception, too, affects quite negatively psychoanalytic practice. Here, too, we shall give one example.

In the USSR we are all against war, against aggressions and aggressors. We strive to foster in our children a love for peace and a feeling of friendship for all peoples and races of all lands. Psychoanalysis bases itself on the false proposition that man is by nature aggressive. Freud, in a letter to the famous Einstein, wrote that war was "a perfectly natural thing; unquestionably, it has a sound psy-

## MONTHLY REVIEW

chological basis and, in fact, it can scarcely be avoided." (*Letters*, Vol. V.) Psychiatrists in America holding to psychoanalytic positions (at least some of them) advise the providing of children with "atomic toys," with comics wallowing in atrocious crimes. This on the assumption that they would provide an outlet for children's aggressive tendencies. Such views cannot but further the spread of the "war psychosis," contribute to juvenile delinquency, and injure the health of the young.

Psychoanalytic theory denies the historical development of man and his psyche. The determining force in shaping man's conduct is, the psychoanalysts believe, instinct, particularly sex.

But the whole of natural science, the entire development of science, indicates that the psyche is the product of historical development, the result of man's being primarily a creature of social forces. The unbiased study of facts indicates rather convincingly that it is not the sexual instinct that provides virtually all the stimuli for human behavior, but, to the contrary, that the human personality as a whole, shaped by history in a social setting, determines the forms of instinctual manifestations.

Freud and his followers do not hesitate to propound a psychoanalytic theory of society and morals. They explain such phenomena as national oppression, the behavior of criminals, the social activities of people as manifestations of the same blind elemental forces, innate instincts, and drives.

Characteristic in this connection, for example, is the way in which Freud attempts to explain the inferior status of women which, as we know, exists in capitalist countries. Now this "inferiority" is wholly conditioned by the social structure of those countries. But unwilling to see this, Freud argued that because of the anatomic differences between the sexes the women themselves see themselves as having been subjected to castration and think it wrong to regard "both sexes as equal in social position and worth." (*Letters*, Vol. V, pp. 196-197.)

It certainly is unthinkable that a scientifically unacceptable theory can offer an acceptable methodology even in one area, the area of treating nervous and psychic disorders.

Because of their disregard of the patho-physiological bases of neuro-psychic disorders, the circle of which is excessively and impermissibly enlarged by the proponents of psychoanalysis, the psychoanalysts underestimate the importance of modern methods of medicinal treatment.

Psychoanalytic therapy fixes its attention on the sexual aspect in the life of the patients. This unavoidably leaves a heavy imprint

## SOVIET VIEW OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

on the patients, gives them a wrong orientation, and results in moral trauma.

The psychoanalytic method of treatment, furthermore, fixes the patient's attention on the distant past, on early childhood, even on the prenatal period. This too pulls the patients away from the present, from the real conflicts in their immediate existence, and from their real and immediate perspectives. Surely it can scarcely be thought that the neuroses developed by an unemployed worker who has been deprived of a livelihood for himself and his family, by a mother who has lost a child, and by a do-nothing whose neurosis arose out of idleness and boredom, out of satiation and lack of any interests, all spring essentially from the same causes that had had their origin in the remote past. We hold that, while due consideration must be given to early, real, proved, and not imagined psychological traumata, the doctor's main attention in the treatment of neurotics must be centered on their present life, on the perspectives of the immediate future; that in the process of psycho-therapy the physician must keep closer to what presently disturbs the patient.

Psychoanalysts cite positive results allegedly obtained through psychoanalytic treatment. The apparent cures of which they boast are, however, in fact but temporary improvements. Such improvements have also been obtained by witch doctors with patients who had blind faith in them. These seeming cures have been known since ancient times, the results of most varied "healing" methods. These are all based on the power of suggestion, the physiological nature of which has been established by Pavlov and his followers. In this connection, we can refer to the many observations appearing in the literature abroad indicating how unstable are the results obtained by the methods of psychoanalytic treatment.

The source of neuroses is traceable to the social relations among people. Neuroses, as Pavlov thought, are affections conditioned by the imposition of excessive demands on the nervous system, in particular, the mental and physical strain resulting from painful experiences (psychic traumas).

This makes possible the development of sound methods for the prevention of neurotic and other psychic disorders. A knowledge of the physiological mechanisms of neuroses makes possible rational medical and psychotherapeutic action.

It is quite different with psychoanalytic theory which reduces the problem of therapy to the digging up and baring of "complexes" of "suppressed desires" in the realm of the unconscious.

As we see it, Freudism finds itself in crying contradiction to the optimistic tendencies of modern progressive science. Instead of exact

## MONTHLY REVIEW

knowledge based on experiment and verified in life, it proffers arbitrarily concocted hypothetical schemes. Instead of paying proper regard to the potency of human reason, Freudism asserts that man and his knowledge are under the sway of elemental inborn forces. Instead of viewing man as the product of socio-historical development, an integral part of his social milieu, Freudism, in substance, affirms the unrelatedness of man's conduct to the multiplicity of external conditions.

Is it not clear that human progress cannot be achieved by irrational and teleological investigations?

Only true science, based on principles of materialistic cognition, will secure the further development of human knowledge and help achieve significant successes in revealing ever more of nature's secrets.

We see Freudism as a form of reaction to the magnificent successes of materialistic scientific knowledge in the fields of physiology and medicine. In this it is not alone. Among the reactionary forces arrayed against genuine science belongs everything that bases itself not on principles of exact scientific method, but on speculative constructions masked as science.

In a fit of candor, Freud himself admitted in a letter to Einstein that his activity was an adventure in science. This, it seems to me, is the most significant of all of Freud's utterances. Freudism was and is an admitted instance of adventure in science. This is the reason why in our country it enjoys neither popularity nor respect.

## A PSYCHOANALYST REPLIES

BY NORMAN REIDER

It was kind of the editors to ask me to write a reply to Dr. Fedotov's comments about psychoanalysis. It is with mixed feelings that I have agreed to do so, because it is a sort of useless gesture to reply in any polemic way to old arguments which are largely

---

*Dr. Reider is Chief of Psychiatry, Mount Zion Hospital, San Francisco; formerly President and now Director of Education of the San Francisco Psychoanalytical Society; and the author of numerous important contributions to psychoanalytical theory.*



derivative of an official governmental stand of long duration in the Soviet Union, which are not the result of an investigatory open-minded attitude towards the nature of psychoanalysis, and which arguments have been answered over and over again in the scientific literature. Nevertheless, the hopelessness of convincing Dr. Fedotov to his satisfaction is somewhat mitigated by the anticipation of a receptiveness on the part of readers to the possibility that Dr. Fedotov's arguments are not the last word in the matter.

I cannot resist the temptation to pick point by point most of the arguments of minor nature throughout Dr. Fedotov's discourse and to attempt to answer them briefly, after which I proceed to what I consider the more valid scientific grounds for the difference of opinion.

By way of initial summary, it can best be said that Dr. Fedotov simply does not understand psychoanalysis or he would not write the way he does. For example, he states that Freud and his followers have been unable to find a method for the objective exploration of the physiology of the brain. It seems that to Dr. Fedotov psychology can only be neurophysiological psychology. Freud made it clear that he left the problems of the biology of man to the biologist, and of the physiology to the physiologist. It is also amply clear to Freud and his followers that there is no dichotomy between psyche and soma as Dr. Fedotov would have one believe. Freud was primarily concerned with the psychic representation of biological phenomena and not their physiology or chemistry, a fact that has never been grasped by many of his critics. Freud did not consider anatomical, chemical, and physiological theories as irrelevant. He considered them quite important in their own field and he even went so far as to express the expectation that some day chemical means would be the method of treating all psychiatric conditions.

An example that Dr. Fedotov gives as the horrendous result of the alleged separating off of psyche from soma in psychoanalytic considerations is a brief quotation from Dr. Franz Alexander about the etiology of ulcers. This criticism of one aspect of research in the psychic aspects of the etiology of ulcers, having mainly to do with libidinal derivatives, is incorrectly represented as being the psychoanalyst's consideration of the total etiology. Psychoanalysts from Freud on have acknowledged that the constitutional diathesis and numerous external factors play very significant roles in all psychosomatic conditions such as ulcers, and they make no bones about it. That they happen to be interested to a great measure in the distribution and fate of certain kinds of libidinal energy in psychosomatic conditions is as much justified as when a biochemist is concerned in highly specialized studies in the cellular metabolism of the tubercle

## MONTHLY REVIEW

bacillus. One might criticize such work in the problem of tuberculosis in regard to many aspects, but one has no right to say that such work is valueless because it does not point out sufficiently the social factors in the etiology of tuberculosis. This is in effect what Dr. Fedotov does.

Nowhere does Dr. Fedotov show his lack of knowledge of Freud's concepts more than in his statement that the import of the external world in psychoanalytic theory is extremely limited; the psychoanalytic concept of the unconscious as having an influence on man's conscious life by no means carries the implication that man is thus fenced off from the world, "from the reality of which he is a part." This is a naive conclusion that is not an inherent part of psychoanalytic theory in the slightest. Nor are Freud's early pessimistic views on the inevitability of war necessarily derivative from his own theories. Apparently Dr. Fedotov is not acquainted with Freud's later opinions on war which were considerably more optimistic. But, alas, it seems that Freud's earlier sociological speculations have had more verification than his later ones.

Surely to attribute to Freud or to his followers any view that they "advise the providing of children with 'atomic toys,' with comics wallowing in atrocious crimes," sounds as if Dr. Fedotov has fallen prey to a mite of propaganda. I know of no psychiatrists, whether of psychoanalytic persuasion or not, who "advise" such practices; I think that at worst a psychiatrist might on one occasion or another resignedly condone them, realizing his relative ineffectiveness in changing the world.

Equally striking in Dr. Fedotov's evidence of misunderstanding of psychoanalysis is the statement that "psychoanalytic theory denies the historical development of man and his psyche." It is the essential core of psychoanalytic theory that it is a genetic psychology, a psychology that places central importance upon the historical development of the psyche. Moreover, it is more explicit in its attempts to show how instinctual forces, which are biologically determined, are constantly undergoing changes under the influence of external factors, a dialectical concept which has more universal applicability than anything that has derived out of Pavlovian neurophysiology or any other system of psychology, at least to date. It is also true that psychoanalytic theory has entered into considerations of sociology, criminology, art, literature and other fields of human endeavor, again via a universality due to the nature of the theory, a claim which cannot be made by Bechterev's or Pavlov's reflexology.

There is a curious contradiction in Dr. Fedotov's arguments. He attacks psychoanalysis as being ahistoric and then he attacks its

treatment method as laying emphasis upon individual history. The same sort of curious contradiction exists in his remark that the source of neuroses is traceable to the social relations among people, a hypothesis which, after agreement as to definition of terms, would be quite acceptable to psychoanalysts as a partial explanation of the phenomenon of neurosis. But Dr. Fedotov continues that, "Neuroses, as Pavlov thought, are affections conditioned by the imposition of excessive demands on the nervous system." Now just what this has to do with social relations among people is not clear, nor is it then clear why such great emphasis is placed upon the medical treatment of neuroses which are caused by social relations. Should they not, therefore, be treated by social means exclusively? Yes and no, I suppose.

This sort of polemic discussion could be continued, but I shall leave these pleasantries to get to the basic issue. For some reason or other there has been a failure of Soviet psychologists to recognize the real essence of Freudian psychology. Their main attack stems largely from the fact that they appreciate some of Freud's concepts as being "idealistic" rather than materialistic. This is quite strange, especially since equally vehement attacks upon psychoanalysis have been made by "reactionaries," who agree with the official definition of Freudianism in the 1955 Soviet edition of the Short Philosophic Dictionary as a science "developing the basest and most repellant instinctual tendencies"—only they call it materialistic and not idealistic! The point is that the theologian's arguments that Freudianism has biologic roots are much closer to the truth than the Soviet view. Yet both fear it (or at least do not like it) and it is interesting to examine why. My own hunch is that all totalitarian systems have to oppose psychoanalytic theory since one of its sociological implications is that of putting the welfare of the individual above the welfare of the state. This by no means settles the question, I fully realize.

What is likewise important is that there exists a considerable literature, reference to which can most easily be found in Jones' third volume of his biography of Freud, just recently published, of extensive discourses on psychoanalysis as dialectical materialism in psychology; this point of view has become quite unfashionable in recent years, perhaps regrettably so—and, then again, perhaps not—but at any rate these arguments are quite cogent and most interesting. Perhaps the Soviet psychologists have no access to the psychoanalytic literature of the 20s and 30s, and that is why such references are absent in the critique. Who knows?

To return: Freud discovered a method, analogous to those methods by which man's urine, sputum, feces, heart sounds, brain waves, and gastric contents can be subjected to analysis and investi-

## MONTHLY REVIEW

gation; Freud found a way by which man's dreams, thoughts, wishes, actions, imaginations, aspirations, reveries, and impulses can be studied. He modeled his own theoretical considerations on those of the physical sciences and achieved a consistent theory of the structure of the psychic apparatus, one of the greatest achievements of the intellect, even though he himself humbly called it an "adventure in science," a subtlety which escapes Dr. Fedotov. Psychoanalysis, as a result of his efforts, is not only a theory but it has now become a body of knowledge and carries along with it a practice based upon the theory. The everchanging and inquiring attitude of the relationship of the theory to the practice, not nearly as doctrinaire as many of its opponents would like to believe, is a remarkable advance in scientific psychology, one which many so-called dialectical materialists would envy if they dared to understand it and give it a try.

Psychoanalysis has its defects in its theory and certainly in its practice, but none of these are those that Dr. Fedotov mentions.

---

*You must live as you think; if not, sooner or later you'll end by thinking as you have lived.*

—Paul Valéry

---

*Never before in human history has homo sapiens felt so unsolved, dissolved so completely in a state of irresolution.*

—Samuel D. Schmalhausen

---

*Man is, at one and the same time, a solitary being and a social being.*

—Albert Einstein

---

*It is only after we have ordered the environment that we can have orderly interior lives.*

—C. Hartley Grattan

---

*Men are like trees, each one must put forth the leaf that is created in him.*

—R. W. Emerson

## STRACHEY AND CAPITALISM

BY SHIGETO TSURU

Franklin D. Roosevelt relates in a letter written to Thomas Lamont in 1942 an episode of his encounter with Maxim Litvinoff in the fall of 1933 when they were holding a series of discussions preliminary to the United States recognition of the Soviet Union.\* When FDR found that Litvinoff was adamant against permitting professional clergymen to enter Russia even after the renewal of diplomatic relations, he exploded in despair, saying "it is useless; we are poles apart!" To this, Litvinoff is quoted as having replied:

I hope you will not feel that way, Mr. President, because I do not. In 1920 we were as far apart as you say. At that time you were one hundred percent capitalistic and we were at the other extreme—zero. In these thirteen years we have risen in the scale to, let us say, a position of twenty. You Americans, especially since last March, have gone to a position of eighty. It is my real belief that in the next twenty years we will go to forty and you will come down to sixty. I do not believe the rapprochement will get closer than that. And while it is difficult for nations to confer with and understand each other with a difference between twenty and eighty, it is wholly possible for them to do so if the difference is only between forty and sixty.

FDR adds the comment that "Litvinoff's answer is worthy of an eventual place in history."

More than twenty years have passed since the date of this episode; and in a significant sense we are tempted to agree with FDR's comment. Although the reality of the cold war has given the appearance of severer conflict than ever between the leading countries of the two camps, capitalism and socialism as *economic systems* seem to have come much closer to each other than a generation ago. Especially in the postwar period, capitalism has learned to adapt itself through a greater degree of control by government over key economic variables; and socialism, on the other hand, has shown a distinct sign of evolution by making increasing use of the price mechanism and the principle of local initiative. Even the matter of public ownership of the means of production, which was once re-

---

*The author is Professor of Economics at Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo.*

\* *The Roosevelt Letters*, edited by Elliott Roosevelt, Vol. III, 1952, pp. 444-445.

## MONTHLY REVIEW

garded as crucial in distinguishing the two systems, seems to have lost its pristine significance. Take, for example, countries like Austria and India where the nationalized sector is relatively quite large; we do not speak of them yet as socialist economies. Few people would doubt the truth of Litvinoff's remark that the two systems, even after closing their gap as nearly as 60 to 40, should and can be distinguished from each other in essential aspects. But at the same time a question is asked more and more as to what really distinguishes socialism from capitalism so far as *economic* aspects are concerned.

### Strachey's Arguments

Strachey's book,\* which we understand constitutes only the first volume of a bigger enterprise, is a timely contribution which attempts essentially to answer the problem just raised. Strachey starts his analysis by characterizing the latest stage of capitalism as "an economy of large and few units" (oligopoly). This circumstance necessarily brings about "the metamorphosis of competition" with the result that the oligopolists acquire the power to control the prices of their products, thus enabling them to affect the level of their own profits also. The degree of economic concentration thus attained renders the self-regulating market mechanism unworkable and opens the door to a much greater degree of state intervention in the affairs of the economy than used to be tolerated in the past. This state intervention, however, could be *either* in the nature of social control on behalf of the population as a whole *or* designed to benefit mainly the class of oligopolistic capitalists. Which way it turns out depends on the strength of the democratic forces in the country concerned. Democracy, the essence of which is the diffusion of power throughout the community, has proved itself capable of counteracting even the so-called law of increasing misery of the working class; and "*if it can maintain itself*, [it] will in fact transform latest-stage capitalism in the end out of existence." (P. 313) For democracy to be effective, however, a society has to be economically over the "hump" in the sense that it has already surmounted the initial stage of industrialization and has attained a level of annual per capita income of at least \$250 or so.

Strachey's argument is clearly one of *political economy*; in fact, admirably so. On the one hand, he appears to be well aware of the importance of analyzing the objective laws and tendencies of an economic system called capitalism—the laws and tendencies which in the first instance can be stated independently of the ideas and aspirations of individual members of the system. Upon these he makes

---

\* John Strachey, *Contemporary Capitalism*, 1956.

impinge the conscious political force of democratic pressure (which is visualized in turn as closely related to a certain level of economic development) which he assumes to be capable of accomplishing even the crucial task of transforming capitalism into socialism. It may be said, therefore, that the main task for a critic is to inquire if Strachey's reliance on democratic pressure is not simply wishful thinking, that is to say, if it can be demonstrated as objectively well-grounded. His conception of the state as a neutral receptacle of political power is, of course, not new; and the issue has been debated repeatedly in the past.\* But the new context in which he raises the issue certainly calls for a re-examination. And a basic issue in this connection, it appears to me, is the essential economic characteristics of capitalism as distinguished from those of socialism, for it could easily be that failure to pursue this distinction to the fullest could lead one to exaggerate the malleability of the capitalistic state machine. It is proposed, therefore, in what remains of this article, to concentrate our discussion on the basic economic issue.

#### What Distinguishes One Economic System From Another?

Let us pose our question in the following manner: what is it that distinguishes different economic systems from each other? I believe that the most fruitful approach is to ask another question and to try to answer it, namely: *who controls the surplus?*

Any society which has progressed in overall productivity beyond the stage of satisfying the bare necessities of its members can be said to have the potentiality of producing a surplus. With further progress in productive powers, what is generally regarded as the bare necessities may gradually change both in quantity and quality and so also will the size of the potential surplus. Such is the *technical* aspect of the surplus which could be discussed more or less independently of the type of economic system at issue. There is, however, another aspect to the surplus, the institutional aspect, which is inextricably related to the specific form of economic organization. For example, under the feudal system the surplus is appropriated by the feudal ruling class and is disposed of in a characteristic manner; under capitalism it takes the form of "surplus value" appropriated by the capitalist class and is again disposed of in a manner characteristic of the system. Those aspects of the surplus which are uniquely related to a particular system are generally referred to as the *form* of the surplus, and it can easily be shown that the *manner of disposal* of the surplus, which appears to be determined mainly by technological conditions, is to a large extent a function of the form.

\* See P. M. Sweezy, *The Theory of Capitalist Development*, 1942, pp. 349-352.

## MONTHLY REVIEW

Let us draw out further implications of this approach by applying it to the comparison of socialism with capitalism. Under socialism, the surplus has the form of a social fund; and, within limits given by technological conditions, its size is an object of social control, being directly determined by the size of investment which is centrally planned. If the central planning authorities decide, for some reason, to lower the level of investment, they can do so by appropriately lowering prices of consumer goods thus automatically reducing the size of the surplus to the required level. The reduction of the surplus constitutes no hindrance to the attainment of full utilization of resources. Under capitalism, however, the surplus takes the form essentially of profit; and each unit of investment depends upon a separate decision which is profit-motivated. Thus the realized profit constitutes the justification for an investment decision taken. Although *aggregatively* it may be said, as Keynesian economists do nowadays, that the volume of investment determines the amount of profit even under capitalism, it should be noted that it does so by causing fluctuations in the level of economic activities at the same time. In the circumstance where the surplus takes the form of profit which acts as the prime motive force of the system, the crucial question is *whether a condition of full employment can be sustained without high profit*. If the answer is negative, as I believe it is, it will be difficult for capitalism to adjust itself to the requirements of a historical stage in its development where a high "propensity to consume" is called for. For a high profit economy is a high investment economy, and a high investment economy is an economy of rapid and constant change. In the late Professor Schumpeter's words, "Whereas a stationary feudal economy would still be a feudal economy, and a stationary socialist economy would still be a socialist economy, stationary capitalism is a contradiction in terms."\*

### Strachey Criticized

I have taken some space to develop my ideas on the criterion for differentiating economic systems in order to make it easier to bring Strachey's position into relief. Let me first quote one of the relevant passages from his book. He writes:

It is becoming clear that what chiefly determines the standard of life of the mass of the population is not the social *form* taken by accumulation, e.g., whether it be private profit or a social fund, but its *amount*. In other words, at any given level of national productivity, what in the main determines the na-

\* J. A. Schumpeter, "Capitalism in the Postwar World," *Postwar Economic Problems*, edited by S. E. Harris, 1943, pp. 116-117.



tional standard of life is not whether accumulation takes the form of private property or a social fund, but whether the rate of accumulation is set high or low. (P. 238. *Italics in the original.*)

This passage seems to indicate that Strachey takes such an optimistic view of what "democratic pressure" can do that so long as the *amount* of the surplus can be raised high and sustained high, the *form* is of little significance and the rest can be taken care of by "the democratic action of the people." He even goes on to say that "what the democratic mechanism is forcing governments, more or less unconsciously, to attempt is, in a word, the socialization of investment." (P. 259.)

The position indicated here would be more acceptable if Strachey had taken a fuller account of the type of analysis sketched in the preceding section and had specified the manner in which "the democratic mechanism" could cope with the objective economic constraints implied in the particular *form* of the surplus. I believe that he has failed to do this. Take, for example, the point that since under capitalism savers and investors are different agents, intended saving and intended investment may diverge, and the divergence tends to have a cumulative effect and to cause fluctuations in output and employment. This set of relations is what I would call "an objective economic constraint" flowing from the fact that the surplus under capitalism takes the particular *form* of private profit. Strachey admits the existence of this set of relations but calls it "a monstrous contingency" and observes that "it is this monstrous contingency, even more than private profit, that 'puts off' the present electorate from accepting a high rate of accumulation." (P. 245.) A passage like this makes one doubt whether Strachey pursued sufficiently the implications of what he himself calls "the social form taken by accumulation." We may point out further that under capitalism, where the fuel which drives the engines of the system is private profit, there is always, and in an increasing measure, a *pressure to sell* which causes the emergence of a whole host of unproductive laborers. This circumstance is especially conspicuous in the United States and makes it impossible for us to accept, without further analysis, a proposition like that implied in the earlier quotation from Strachey, to the effect that the national standard of life is higher the higher the rate of accumulation is. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to believe that the continued prosperity of a country like the United States has depended, in a large measure, upon the institutionalization of various kinds of *waste* (such as defense expenditures, selling cost, the acceleration of obsolescence, and so on) and that this trend is inherent in the capitalist mode of production.

## MONTHLY REVIEW

In short, both on theoretical and empirical grounds, I feel that the form which the surplus assumes in a particular system of economy is not so malleable as Strachey makes it out to be, and accordingly that the task of the political economist requires a much greater degree of realism than is manifested in Strachey's book on the possibilities and limitations of the democratic mechanism within the framework of capitalistic constraints.

### A Suggestion

Vision of what is ahead for human society, however, often comes from a person who is prone to minimize what appear to be the objective limitations. In this sense, there is much that can be learned from occasional remarks in Strachey's book. Take, for example, the following passage:

What has to be done is to provide some way in which the system's mainspring, namely, investment in new means of production, can be undertaken at a rational rate, without interruption, and independently of fluctuation in the expectation of profit-making. If—but only if—that can be done, much of the rest of the economic mechanism can, if this is convenient or expedient, be left in private hands to be operated under the hope of profit and the fear of loss. (P. 249.)

In the light of what we have said earlier, this paragraph may be cited as another example of Strachey's inclination to slight the *form* of the surplus. But if we concentrate only on the first half of the paragraph (adding, however, a clause "in directions consistent with the long-range welfare of the people as a whole"), we may say that here we are given a vision of a strategy for evolutionary socialism which should be explored much more seriously than it has yet been, namely, to subject the *flow* of surplus to social control rather than to place the *ownership* of the surplus-generating stock of capital in public hands. Such a strategy would involve a greater use of price controls on intermediate goods, and of indirect taxes on consumer goods as a means of channelizing the surplus into public hands. It would be a strategy that could be applied by degrees, gradually changing its character from the socialization of the flow into that of the stock. If Strachey was actually thinking in terms of policies of this type, I hope that he will develop and discuss more practical aspects of these measures in future instalments of his work. Socialists residing in other capitalist countries could benefit greatly from such explorations on his part.

# WORLD EVENTS

*By Scott Nearing*

## Space Travel

Space travel from our planet made its bow to the modern world on Friday, October 4, 1957, when Soviet scientists launched an earth satellite. The sphere weighed 184 pounds, was equipped with a radio transmitter, had a speed of 18,000 miles per hour, and began circling the globe at a height of about 400 miles each 96 minutes, or 15 times a day. Within a short time after the launching, it was spotted and reported from various observation posts here and abroad.

Scientists and commentators vied with one another in emphasizing the epochal nature of the development. Reports on the nature and whereabouts of the space satellite stole the headlines from the Middle East crisis, the baseball series, and the Teamsters' Convention in Miami Beach. The *New York Times* published a generous and gracious editorial on October 5th, congratulating the Russians and commenting on the far-reaching consequences which must follow on such an achievement.

Soviet scientists and spokesmen took congratulations in their stride. They were not resting on their laurels, but working (1) to launch a larger "sputnik" or satellite; (2) to make it possible for such a satellite to return to earth through the denser layers of the atmosphere without burning up; (3) to enclose living creatures in a satellite—animals at first, later men; (4) to build a space-landing stage that will circle the planet in much the same way that the Soviet sputnik is presently doing; (5) to launch craft from the landing stage that will travel through outer space.

## The Seven League Boots of Science

Some readers may lift their eyebrows and murmur "Bolshevik propaganda." Before they make such a retort they should survey some of the developments of science and technology during our lifetimes.

We are older than the average, yet not so very ancient as time runs. Brought up in a backwoods mining town in northern Pennsylvania, we can remember the first two-wheel bicycle ("safety," it was called) that came to town; the first telephone that was installed; the introduction of electricity into the mines, and then into public

## MONTHLY REVIEW

buildings and homes; the first phonograph; the first automobile. Much younger people remember the first movie, radio, television set, and the first splitting of the atom.

He who would be wise and sane, in the face of recent space travel developments, should remind himself that the achievements of science and engineering, which he and we have seen during recent decades, represent only one level of advance. Beneath this present level lie the scientific developments of the past four or five centuries and the engineering utilization of scientific discoveries in the modification of man's relations with nature, with society, and with himself.

All critics of space flight, especially experts, should remember that while the Wright Brothers were making their first faltering flights, a learned scientist read a paper in which he proved to the satisfaction of his highly-trained auditors that the flight of a heavier-than-air machine was an impossibility. Two of our grandfathers were engineers. If they had been foolhardy, they could have said with conviction, and to the applause of their contemporaries, that men could never communicate without wires, nor travel in heavier than air machines, nor convert sawdust into diaphanous tough fabrics, nor travel through outer space. All of these things were "impossible" and certainly unknown in 1857 or even in 1897. How different is the story in 1957.

Human imagination leaps and soars in the arts, poetry, metaphysics; in science and mathematics; in the writing of utopias and science fiction. Imagination plus experimentation yields discovery and invention. Only one thing can be said with any certainty about this area of human theory and practice: Science is moving so rapidly on so broad and deep a front, including the social field, that it is impossible for an individual to say today what tomorrow will or will not bring to pass.

### The Revolution of Our Time

We have noted in considerable detail (see *Revolution of Our Time*, Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine) (1) recent changes in science and technology; (2) the impact of these changes on social practices, institutions, and outlooks; (3) the unbalance resulting from a failure of one segment of the culture pattern to keep pace with changes in other segments; (4) therefore the urgent necessity for some group in every community which can see the problem in its entirety, (5) evaluate the probable consequences of changes now taking place, (6) keep the citizenry thoroughly informed on the nature of social change, the character and effects of current changes, and their direction, and (7) take steps to preserve the social balance

by coordinating the rate of change in various segments of the community. Advances in science, and especially in engineering, have upset established patterns of thought and life and compelled readjustment. If such upsets are planned for and prepared for, people take the changes in their stride. Should the changes come suddenly and from an unexpected quarter, they produce uncertainty, insecurity, and often violent reactions.

### Counter-Revolution

Natural sciences accept the axiom that action and reaction are equal and opposite. This principle is equally descriptive of social relations. Hence any quick change or revolution must be expected to produce an equal and opposite counter-revolution.

Revolution has convulsed and upset the relations between man and nature during recent centuries. Likewise it has subverted social relations, turning them upside down. (This, by the way, is the dictionary meaning of "subvert.") Social upset or revolution ("to turn over, as of a wheel; to turn through 360 degrees") has produced the inevitable counter-revolution.

Chief among counter-revolutionary elements are the vested interests—those which enjoyed preferment and privilege in the existing social order. Slaveholders resented and resisted emancipation. Landlords opposed and defied land collectivization.

More massive, though less violent, is the opposition to change offered by the folkways—the traditional, customary, habitual outlooks, formulas, and methods of doing things. Folkways express social inertia, the tendency of a body to continue in a state of rest or motion until it encounters a force sufficiently great to modify the existing condition.

Recent discoveries and inventions have played havoc with the folkways—in fabrication, transportation, communication, in dietary habits, clothing, housing, in education, recreation, health. Peoples depend on the folkways, cling to them, defend them against profanation. Such champions of the established social order provide the mass support needed to effectivize counter-revolution.

### How Fast Can We Go?

Juxtaposition and contradiction between the forces making for social change and the forces seeking to preserve the established order are rampant across the planet. The program of land collectivization in East Europe; the efforts to abolish caste privileges in India; the decision to integrate schools in the Deep South, run into a hornet's nest of opposition which is usually silent, stubborn,

## MONTHLY REVIEW

subterranean, but sometimes open and violent. Forces of change confront the forces of inertia, of the status quo.

Fantastic speed-up in scientific theory and in engineering practice have upset established life patterns, not only in the centers of mass production and mass communication and transportation, but in the more remote places penetrated by kerosene and gasoline, by the printing press, by electronics, hydraulics, plastics, and atomics. The great upsetters and subverters of the last 75 years are not the socialists and communists, but the mathematicians, physicists, chemists, and the planners, designers, draftsmen, mechanics, organizers, and administrators who have converted the new theories into a multiplicity of new forms and practices.

How fast can we take it? Can we delight in and utilize the new, the unexpected, the unusual? Or must we scream out our agony when we are asked to change our way of life, then gang up on the innovator and ride him out of town on a fence-rail?

### To Equal and Excel

This problem of the rate of social change is the nub of the West-East conflict. Both sides agree that changes must come. The West, secure in its industrial wealth, its world-girdling political and military power, its gadgets, comforts and conveniences, is satisfied to make haste slowly. Victims of hunger, backwardness, segregation, exploitation and oppression in the erstwhile colonies are in a hurry. They want self-determination, prosperity, and peace. They want these things here and now. Hence the drive of revolution in Asia-Africa-Latin America. Hence the outpourings of energy and the ambitious plans to overtake, equal, and excel.

Spectacularly the interplay of these forces was dramatized on October 4 when scientists from a nation rated "backward" by the West, overcame the pull of gravitation, hurled a mass of metal beyond the denser atmosphere and sent it beeping on its calculated course around the earth. Four decades earlier Lenin had been derided for declaring that the Soviet Union someday would equal and excel the West. Sputnik was the visible fulfillment of Lenin's prophecy.

Politicians and the President began by belittling and scoffing. "It makes little difference." "They stole our secrets." "It was the German captive engineers who were responsible." "We can do bigger and better things when we get to it." On second thought the more receptive and responsible changed their tune. Said Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, who is well informed on weapons technology: "The question is not whether we are losing the race for the ICBM. We are losing it. The problem is not how to stay

ahead. It is how to catch up." The Defense Department in Washington realizes that the United States must develop a space project that will "match and surpass the Soviet Union's effort."

If Washington is eager to "catch up" with Soviet science and engineering, its responsible leaders should note several relevant items. (1) Soviet elementary schools, high schools, junior colleges, and universities are emphasizing mathematics, science, foreign languages, at the same time that United States education is dropping them from the course of study. An article in the *New York Times* Sunday magazine for September 15, 1957, reported that only 165 of the 1800 United States colleges teach Russian to some 4,000 students, while 10 million Soviet students are studying English. (2) the *British Book-seller* gives the yearly output of book titles (different books published) as 11,901 for the United States and 50,109 for the Soviet Union. (*Northern Neighbors*, October 1957, p. 9) (3) The Soviet Union graduates yearly about two and one half times as many scientists and engineers as the United States. (4) These Soviet graduates are well paid and have excellent working equipment, particularly for research. If the United States is to "catch up" it must provide more courses in mathematics, science, languages, more books, more incentive for young people to study and prepare themselves as responsible natural and social scientists and engineers.

### Two Quids Pro Quo

"Soviet Russia strengthened its foothold in Syria by flying in 18 experts to complete details of a big program of long-term aid, at 2½ per cent interest. They brought plans for highways, dams, mineral surveys, new industries. At the same time, Moscow reported two Soviet warships en route to Syria for a 'friendly' call. Jordan warned Syria 'international communism poses an immediate danger to peace.' U.S. sent 40 heavy tanks to Jordan." (*U.S. News & World Report*, Sept. 27, 1957.)

The Soviet personnel sent to Syria are reported to be fluent in Syriac and some of the local dialects, and to be of the Moslem faith. Dollars and guns are no match for an understanding of the local culture pattern and preparations to meet local needs.

### Impermanent or Permanent?

Secretary of State Dulles has a pet saying: "We must look upon the Government of the Chinese Peoples' Republic as impermanent rather than permanent." He is quite right. After 38 years of civil war (1911-1948) had liquidated or brushed aside many important aspects of the established culture pattern in China, quite different

## MONTHLY REVIEW

economic, political and social outlooks, activities, and institutions were outlined and inaugurated in 1948-1949. During the decade which followed, the new culture pattern began to take theoretical and practical form. At the present moment this process is continuing in China. Hence the "impermanence" to which the Secretary refers.

Social changes have not been limited to China, however. During this same span of years, 1911-1957, the economic, political, and social theory and practice of the West have been turned upside down. This has been notably true in the field of science and technology. It is equally true in the field of politics. The British Empire has been downgraded; the French and Italian Empires have been dismembered; the German and Japanese Empires have been liquidated; the Empire of the Tsars has disappeared. Even the United States, which escaped most of the physical damage inflicted by the wars and revolutions of the past four decades, has been transformed from a pluto-democratic republic into a government by a plutocratic oligarchy, operating a police state, spearheaded by the military.

Social change has been widely pervasive during the present generation of eventful advances in science and technology. Unless discovery and invention can be bottled up, the rate of change in the immediate future will probably be accelerated rather than retarded.

Transition and transformation are the order of the day all over the world. Instead of ostracising the Chinese Peoples' Republic because it is "impermanent," the State Department should congratulate its spokesmen for their successful efforts to overcome backwardness and to take full advantage of the multitudinous inventions and discoveries which are revolutionizing both the theory and practice of economics, politics, sociology, psychology, and cosmology.

**HAVE YOU  
JOINED THE  
ASSOCIATES YET?**



# CHRISTMAS GIFT OFFER

We want to increase our circulation. You have to solve your Christmas gift problem. Here's a way of doing both at a big saving to you:

## \$10.75 Value for Only \$4.00

For every NEW sub you send us, we will give you, ABSOLUTELY FREE, a copy of Agnes Smedley's stirring book *The Great Road: The Life and Times of Chu Teh*, 461 pages, map, price \$6.75.

You may send the sub to one address, the book to another, and a gift card to each.

Send as many subs as you like—A FREE BOOK IS YOURS WITH EVERY ONE OF THEM.

Suggested order form

MONTHLY REVIEW • 66 Barrow Street • New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose \$\_\_\_\_\_ (\$4 for each subscription and book).

Send subscription to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_  
(PLEASE PRINT)

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Gift card from \_\_\_\_\_

Send book to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_  
(PLEASE PRINT)

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Gift card from \_\_\_\_\_

N.B. This is a special offer which ends at midnight December 31. It does NOT apply to renewals—only to new subs.

## SUB AND BOOK OFFERS

Monthly Review, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose:

- ☐ \$4 for a one-year subscription
- ☐ \$7 for a two-year subscription
- ☐ \$5 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE BENDING CROSS by Ray Ginger (list price \$5)  
\_\_\_\_\_ MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman (paper edition)
- ☐ \$6 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:  
\_\_\_\_\_ WAS JUSTICE DONE? by Malcolm P. Sharp (list price \$3.50)  
\_\_\_\_\_ SOCIALISTS AROUND THE WORLD by Helen and Scott Nearing (list price \$3)
- ☐ \$7 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:  
\_\_\_\_\_ A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM? by Konni Zilliecus (list price \$5)  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE SOUTH AFRICAN TREASON TRIAL by Forman and Sachs (list price \$5)  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran (list price \$5)  
\_\_\_\_\_ AMERICAN RADICALS ed. by Harvey Goldberg (list price \$5)  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE PRESENT AS HISTORY by Paul M. Sweezy (list price \$5)  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE CHINESE ECONOMY by Solomon Adler (list price \$5)
- ☐ \$8 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley (list price \$6.75)  
\_\_\_\_\_ THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy (list price \$6)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

☐ This is a new subscription ☐ This is a renewal

All prices include postage. Send your order, with payment enclosed, to  
Monthly Review, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

(continued from inside front cover)

The *American Historical Review*, October issue, says of MR Press book *American Radicals*, edited by Professor Harvey Goldberg, "a stimulating collection, intelligently conceived, written, and edited." We agree.

The returns on our questionnaire, *Who Are You?*, designed to enable us to know more about our readers are pouring in at a great rate. We will, of course, publish the results as soon as the survey is completed and we are sure you will find the answers as fascinating as we do. Our thanks to all those who have already sent in their answers—and an urgent reminder to those who haven't.

Thanks, too, for the generous response to the Associates' appeal. We are running a little ahead of last year and hope to do even better in the months to come. Have you joined the Associates yet?

In a short article in the French newspaper *Le Monde* on November 2, Paul Sweezy, then in Paris en route to Moscow, was described, to our amazement, as "*ancien professeur d'économie politique. . .*" But though the first meaning given in the dictionary is "ancient," the word also means "former" and the latter meaning is what we hope was intended.

No important news from him as we go to press. He will be back, however, by the end of December and will give a report of his travels at the first Associates meeting of this season on Wednesday, January 15, in New York City. Full details later—meanwhile save the date, and remember that Associates get in free.

A Japanese student at a midwest university writes us:

I had known before I came here that in this country the people who are on the side of the oppressed and believe that socialism is the only way to solve the problems of our time are fighting a difficult and somewhat desperate struggle, isolated from the majority of the people. But I had expected that I could meet a few students or professors who know the direction of human history. I'm sorry, however, that I have not found a single person who really understands socialism. To my surprise and disappointment, even the professors talk in the same way as Mr. Dulles.

Happily, we were able to introduce our foreign friend to some students and professors who do not share Mr. Dulles' views. Though things are tough for the Left there is, on almost every campus, a small group that does know the score.

On Friday evening, December 6, at the Great Northern Hotel, New York City, the American Forum for Socialist Education will give a reception to its chairman, A. J. Muste, for his role in promoting "untrammeled political discussion including spokesmen of all points of view" during the past two years. An example of untrammeled political discussion will be given next day at the same hotel at a conference called by the American Forum on the subject "America's Future in the Age of Automation and Atomic Energy." Speakers include Carl Dreher, Sidney Lens, Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Harvey Swados, Russell Johnson, Michael Harrington, and Murray Kempton.

In Baltimore, on December 6, Harry Braverman, co-editor of *The American Socialist*, will debate with Dr. Abba Lerner, professor of economics, on the subject "Will the Boom Bust?". Mt. Lebanon Baptist Church, 2320 Reisterstown Road, 8:30 P.M.

Season's greetings to all, and our special thanks to those good friends who have joined the Associates and are sending in *new subs*.

## *Three New MR Press Books . . .*

### **A New Birth of Freedom?**

by Konni Zilliacus

A study of conditions "behind the iron curtain" by one of the world's most experienced experts on international affairs. Mr. Zilliacus, Labor Member of the British Parliament, spent several months in Eastern Europe in late 1956. He gives a down-to-earth analysis of the causes and effects of the famous Khrushchev report and the Polish and Hungarian revolutions.

*Price in January, \$5*

**Special prepublication price, \$3.**

*Save \$2 by ordering now!*

### **The South African Treason Trial**

by Lionel Forman and E. S. Sachs

The first part of this timely book describes the trial of the 156 opponents of apartheid who were charged with treason. It is written by one of the accused, Lionel Forman, who is a barrister and editor of New Age. The second part, written by Solly Sachs, exiled secretary of the Garment Workers Union, gives the social and political background of what is happening in South Africa.

*Price in January, \$5*

**Special prepublication price, \$3.**

*Save \$2 by ordering now!*

### **Socialists Around the World**

by Helen and Scott Nearing

There are socialists in every land. In some countries they are still muzzled and imprisoned. In other countries they hold the highest offices and shape public opinion and public policy. The Nearings talked to socialists in North America, Europe and Asia. With this book they take you to these people and let you listen in on their conversations.

*Price in January, \$3*

**Special prepublication price, \$2.**

*Save \$1 by ordering now!*

.....  
**MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS**

66 Barrow Street, New York 14

I enclose \$..... Send me as soon as published:

- ☐ A New Birth of Freedom? (\$3 now)  
☐ The South African Treason Trial (\$3 now)  
☐ Socialists Around the World (\$2 now)

NAME .....  
(Print)

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE .....

